

Halo orbits around the collinear points of the restricted three-body problem

Marta Ceccaroni¹

*Department of Mathematics, University of Roma Tor Vergata,
Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 1 - 00133 Roma*

Alessandra Celletti²

*Department of Mathematics, University of Roma Tor Vergata,
Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma (Italy)*

Giuseppe Pucacco³

*Department of Physics, University of Roma Tor Vergata,
Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma (Italy)*

Keywords: Three-body problem, Collinear points, Halo orbits, Finite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems, Perturbation theory, Normal forms.
2000 MSC: 37N05, 37L10, 37J35, 37J40, 70F15

HIGHLIGHTS

- We consider halo orbits around the collinear Lagrangian-Eulerian points.
- An analytical estimate of the bifurcation threshold to halo orbits is obtained.
- The method is based on a normal form adapted to the synchronous resonance.
- A reduction to the central manifold is then performed.
- We make a comparison with available numerical data.

¹ceccaron@mat.uniroma2.it

²celletti@mat.uniroma2.it

³Corresponding author: pucacco@roma2.infn.it; telephone/fax: +39 06 72594541.

Halo orbits around the collinear points of the restricted three-body problem

Marta Ceccaroni¹

*Department of Mathematics, University of Roma Tor Vergata,
Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 1 - 00133 Roma*

Alessandra Celletti²

*Department of Mathematics, University of Roma Tor Vergata,
Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma (Italy)*

Giuseppe Pucacco³

*Department of Physics, University of Roma Tor Vergata,
Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma (Italy)*

Abstract

We perform an analytical study of the bifurcation of the halo orbits around the collinear points L_1 , L_2 , L_3 for the circular, spatial, restricted three-body problem. Following a standard procedure, we reduce to the center manifold constructing a normal form adapted to the synchronous resonance. Introducing a detuning, which measures the displacement from the resonance and expanding the energy in series of the detuning, we are able to evaluate the energy level at which the bifurcation takes place for arbitrary values of the mass ratio. In most cases, the analytical results thus obtained are in very good agreement with the numerical expectations, providing the bifurcation threshold with good accuracy. Care must be taken when dealing with L_3 for small values of the mass-ratio between the primaries; in that case, the model of the system is a singular perturbation problem and the normal form method is not particularly suited to evaluate the bifurcation threshold.

1. Introduction

In the *circular, spatial, restricted three-body problem* (hereafter CSR3BP), in the synodic frame, the *collinear* equilibrium points discovered by Euler are located on the line joining the two primaries: L_1 lies within them, L_2 , L_3 are outside the interval joining the primaries. For values of the mass ratio μ of the primaries

¹ceccaron@mat.uniroma2.it

²celletti@mat.uniroma2.it

³Corresponding author: pucacco@roma2.infn.it; telephone/fax: +39 06 72594541.

corresponding to usual applications like the barycenter-Sun system (namely, the system describing the interaction between the Earth–Moon barycenter and the Sun) or the Earth-Moon case, the equilibria L_1 , L_2 are close to the smaller primary, while L_3 is quite far on the opposite side of the larger primary. Moreover, two cases are of special interest: $\mu = 0$ and $\mu = 1/2$. The limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$ can be interpreted as a *Hill's problem* for L_1 and L_2 , where the two equilibria tend to an equal distance from the smaller primary and the problem is equivalent to let one of the primaries go to infinity as in the classical lunar theory developed by G.W. Hill in [17]; in the case of L_3 , again in the limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$, we will speak about a *quasi-Kepler problem*, since it is equivalent to a nearly two-body problem in the rotating frame. On the opposite side of the mass parameter range, namely the case of equal masses, i.e. $\mu = 1/2$, we find that the equilibrium L_1 is midway from the primaries and L_2 , L_3 are at the same distance from the primaries on each side. The case of such large mass ratio is typically applicable to binary stars or some exotic exo-planetary systems with very large planets.

Overall, in the whole range $\mu \in (0, 1/2]$, we get a very rich dynamical setting with several peculiar phenomena (stability-instability transitions, bifurcations, etc.) characterizing the non-integrable Hamiltonian system associated to the CSR3BP. As it is well known, the collinear points are linearly unstable. However, since the seminal paper by C. Conley [6] on the so-called transit-orbits through L_1 , much attention has been devoted to the use of the collinear points for space missions [9], thanks to the fact that the unstable behavior can be easily controlled for a reasonable time-span. Moreover, the characteristics of the evolving unstable/stable pathways offer a structure that can be suitably exploited to design transfer orbits between different regions of the phase space.

On the same ground, the unstable dynamics offers a *clean* environment free of debris and dust. Indeed, a neighborhood of L_1 can be considered a privileged position to observe the Sun, while L_2 is very good to observe the Universe shielding the Sun through the Earth.

To study the dynamics around these points, numerical methods provide high accuracy and fast algorithms to follow the evolution from given initial conditions. However, the analytical theory gives a deeper insight into the nature of the global behavior in a neighborhood of these solutions, so to get a comprehensive description of the dynamics in the whole mass range ([13, 5, 3]). For example, the phenomena connected with low-order resonances around equilibria play a leading role in shaping the phase-space structure and provide a coarse picture of the global dynamics. Finer details like secondary resonances or heteroclinic intersections are often confined to small portions of the phase-space and usually require dedicated numerical experiments.

The aim of this paper is to present an analytical method to predict the bifurcation thresholds of the *halo orbits* around the three collinear points for arbitrary values of the mass ratio: in the present setting this is the most prominent effect of the resonance in the whole interval between the two extreme cases $\mu = 0$ and $\mu = 1/2$. According to Lyapunov's centre theorem, each collinear point generates

a pair of one-parameter families of periodic orbits (the nonlinear *normal modes*), to which we refer as the planar and the vertical Lyapunov families. By halo orbit we intend the family of periodic orbits, which arise at the first 1:1 bifurcation from the planar Lyapunov family. A resonant perturbation theory allows us to investigate the halo family and to determine the value of the energy at which the bifurcation from the planar Lyapunov family, namely the *horizontal* normal mode, takes place [24]. We also construct a normal form to perform the center manifold reduction (see [13]), which yields an integrable approximation of the dynamics (compare with [20]). The unperturbed linear dynamics on the 2-dimensional center manifold is characterized by almost equal values of the frequencies for all mass ratios. Therefore it is natural to introduce a *detuning* parameter, which describes the departure from the exact resonance [16, 29]. By increasing the energy, the bifurcations of the 1:1 resonant periodic orbits from the normal modes can be expressed as series expansions in the detuning.

Our results show that for L_1 and L_2 the prediction of the energy threshold of the bifurcation is very accurate (up to the fourth decimal digit), when compared with numerical data available in the literature (see [10, 11]), even limiting just to a second-order computation; however, we make the effort of computing higher orders to look for the best agreement (if any) with available data. Moreover, our strategy allows us to improve previous analytical approaches based on Lindstedt series [25] and to determine first order approximations of the initial conditions for the first bifurcating orbits. In the case of L_3 , the peculiar nature of the dynamics around it [28], especially when the mass ratio is less than the Earth-Moon value, gives much less accurate results, but our approach is still useful for a qualitative understanding. In this respect, we provide an explanation for the results concerning L_3 in terms of the optimal order of the Birkhoff normalization procedure applied to a singular perturbation problem.

This work is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the equations of motion and the location of the collinear points of the CSR3BP. The corresponding Hamiltonian is diagonalized, normalized and reduced to the center manifold in Section 3. In Section 4 we provide analytical formulae for the bifurcation thresholds at different orders of normalization. In Section 5 we present the results of our analytical approach and we compare them with the corresponding numerical values. Section 6 provides some conclusions on the results of the present work.

2. Collinear points in the three-body problem

We consider a synodic reference frame centered in the barycenter of the primaries, which are denoted as $\mathcal{P}_1$, $\mathcal{P}_2$, and rotating with the angular velocity of the primaries. The X axis is set along the line joining $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$, the Z axis along the angular momentum and the Y axis in such a way to have a positively oriented frame. We normalize the units of measure so that the gravitational constant as well as the sum of the masses of the primaries are unity. Let us rename μ the mass of

the smaller primary; then, with the previous normalization it results that the larger primary is located⁴ at $(\mu, 0, 0)$, while the smaller one is at $(\mu - 1, 0, 0)$. The equations of motion of a third small body in the synodic reference frame admit five equilibrium points discovered by L. Euler and J.-L. Lagrange: the triangular and the collinear points (see, e.g., [4], [22]). The triangular points L_4 and L_5 are linearly stable whenever μ is smaller than a threshold, called *Routh's value*. On the contrary, the collinear points L_1, L_2, L_3 are shown to be always linearly unstable.

Let us define the kinetic moments P_X, P_Y, P_Z as

$$P_X = \dot{X} - Y, \quad P_Y = \dot{Y} + X, \quad P_Z = \dot{Z};$$

the initial Hamiltonian function describing the motion of the third body is given by

$$H^{(IN)}(P_X, P_Y, P_Z, X, Y, Z) = \frac{1}{2}(P_X^2 + P_Y^2 + P_Z^2) + YP_X - XP_Y - \frac{1-\mu}{r_1} - \frac{\mu}{r_2}, \quad (1)$$

where r_1, r_2 denote the distances from the primaries:

$$r_1 = \sqrt{(X - \mu)^2 + Y^2 + Z^2}, \quad r_2 = \sqrt{(X - \mu + 1)^2 + Y^2 + Z^2}.$$

Let us introduce the scalar function, sometimes called *pseudo-potential* (compare with [22]):

$$\Omega(X, Y, Z) \equiv \frac{1}{2}(X^2 + Y^2) + \frac{1-\mu}{r_1} + \frac{\mu}{r_2};$$

then, the equations of motion can be written in compact form as

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{X} - 2\dot{Y} &= \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial X}, \\ \ddot{Y} + 2\dot{X} &= \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial Y}, \\ \ddot{Z} &= \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we translate the origin so that it coincides with a collinear point; to this end, we determine the distance γ_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$, of the collinear equilibria from the closest primary as the solution of the fifth order Euler's equations (see, e.g., [13]):

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1^5 - (3 - \mu)\gamma_1^4 + (3 - 2\mu)\gamma_1^3 - \mu\gamma_1^2 + 2\mu\gamma_1 - \mu &= 0 & \text{for } L_1, \\ \gamma_2^5 + (3 - \mu)\gamma_2^4 + (3 - 2\mu)\gamma_2^3 - \mu\gamma_2^2 - 2\mu\gamma_2 - \mu &= 0 & \text{for } L_2, \\ \gamma_3^5 + (2 + \mu)\gamma_3^4 + (1 + 2\mu)\gamma_3^3 - (1 - \mu)\gamma_3^2 - 2(1 - \mu)\gamma_3 - (1 - \mu) &= 0 & \text{for } L_3. \end{aligned}$$

⁴Notice that with the present convention the equilibrium point L_2 is located to the left of the smaller primary, L_1 lies between the primaries and L_3 stands at the right of the larger primary.

Afterwards, we introduce new coordinates (x, y, z) through the following transformation, which also takes into account a rescaling of the distances:

$$X = \mp \gamma_j x + \mu + a, \quad Y = \mp \gamma_j y, \quad Z = \gamma_j z,$$

where the upper signs hold for L_1 , L_2 , while the lower signs are referred to L_3 ; moreover, we set $a = -1 + \gamma_1$ for L_1 , $a = -1 - \gamma_2$ for L_2 , $a = \gamma_3$ for L_3 . Denoting by $P_n = P_n(\chi)$ the Legendre polynomial of order n and argument χ , the equations of motion in the new variables can be written in the following form [13], where the pseudo-potential Ω has been expanded in terms of the Legendre polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x} - 2\dot{y} - (1 + 2c_2)x &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \sum_{n \geq 3} c_n(\mu) \rho^n P_n\left(\frac{x}{\rho}\right) \\ \ddot{y} + 2\dot{x} + (c_2 - 1)y &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \sum_{n \geq 3} c_n(\mu) \rho^n P_n\left(\frac{x}{\rho}\right) \\ \ddot{z} + c_2 z &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \sum_{n \geq 3} c_n(\mu) \rho^n P_n\left(\frac{x}{\rho}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\rho = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}$ and where the coefficients c_n , $n \geq 2$, are given by the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} c_n(\mu) &= \frac{1}{\gamma_1^3} \left(\mu + (-1)^n \frac{(1 - \mu) \gamma_1^{n+1}}{(1 - \gamma_1)^{n+1}} \right) && \text{for } L_1, \\ c_n(\mu) &= \frac{(-1)^n}{\gamma_2^3} \left(\mu + \frac{(1 - \mu) \gamma_2^{n+1}}{(1 + \gamma_2)^{n+1}} \right) && \text{for } L_2, \\ c_n(\mu) &= \frac{(-1)^n}{\gamma_3^3} \left(1 - \mu + \frac{\mu \gamma_3^{n+1}}{(1 + \gamma_3)^{n+1}} \right) && \text{for } L_3. \end{aligned}$$

Introducing the conjugated momenta $p_x = \dot{x} - y$, $p_y = \dot{y} + x$, $p_z = \dot{z}$, we write the Hamiltonian associated to (2) as

$$H^{(in)}(p_x, p_y, p_z, x, y, z) = \frac{1}{2} (p_x^2 + p_y^2 + p_z^2) + y p_x - x p_y - \sum_{n \geq 2} c_n(\mu) \rho^n P_n\left(\frac{x}{\rho}\right). \quad (3)$$

We remark that the relation between $H^{(IN)}$ in (1) and $H^{(in)}$ in (3) is given by (see [10])

$$H^{(IN)} = H^{(in)} \gamma_1^2 - \frac{1}{2} (1 - \gamma_1 - \mu)^2 - \frac{\mu}{\gamma_1} - \frac{1 - \mu}{1 - \gamma_1} \quad (4)$$

for L_1 , by

$$H^{(IN)} = H^{(in)} \gamma_2^2 - \frac{1}{2} (1 + \gamma_2 - \mu)^2 - \frac{\mu}{\gamma_2} - \frac{1 - \mu}{1 + \gamma_2} \quad (5)$$

for L_2 , and by

$$H^{(IN)} = H^{(in)} \gamma_3^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_3 + \mu)^2 - \frac{1 - \mu}{\gamma_3} - \frac{\mu}{1 + \gamma_3} \quad (6)$$

for L_3 . We also remark that the series at the right hand side of (3) is a sum of homogeneous polynomials (with coefficients $c_n(\mu)$), say $T_n(x, y, z) \equiv \rho^n P_n\left(\frac{x}{\rho}\right)$, which can be iteratively computed by means of the following formulae:

$$T_0 = 1, \quad T_1 = x, \quad T_n = \frac{2n-1}{n} x T_{n-1} - \frac{n-1}{n} \rho^2 T_{n-2}.$$

3. Normalization and center manifold reduction

In the present section we describe the procedures to construct an integrable approximation of the resonant dynamics around the collinear points. A straightforward way to achieve this goal consists in performing a resonant normalization of (3): this is discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. A slightly different method has been adopted in [5] on the basis of the approach introduced in [27, 13]. This alternative strategy will be briefly discussed in Section 3.4.

3.1. Diagonalization of the Hamiltonian

Linearizing (3) around the given equilibrium point, we obtain that the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian is of the form:

$$H_2^{(in)}(p_x, p_y, p_z, x, y, z) = \frac{1}{2} (p_x^2 + p_y^2) + y p_x - x p_y - c_2 x^2 + \frac{c_2}{2} y^2 + \frac{p_z^2}{2} + \frac{c_2}{2} z^2, \quad (7)$$

where the coefficient c_2 provides the frequency ω_z of the z -direction, being $\omega_z = \sqrt{c_2}$. We now aim at diagonalizing (7) through a standard procedure, that we sketch here for self-consistency (we refer to [13, 5] for full details). Since the (p_z, z) components are already diagonalized, let us focus on the remaining variables, for which we write the equations of motion in the form $\dot{\xi} = J \nabla H_2^{(in)} = M \xi$, where $\xi \equiv (x, y, p_x, p_y)^T$, J is the symplectic matrix and

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 2c_2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -c_2 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The characteristic polynomial associated to M is

$$p(\lambda) = \lambda^4 + (2 - c_2)\lambda^2 + (1 + c_2 - 2c_2^2);$$

the equation $p(\lambda) = 0$ admits the solutions given by the square roots of the quantities η_1, η_2 , defined as

$$\eta_1 = \frac{c_2 - 2 - \sqrt{9c_2^2 - 8c_2}}{2}, \quad \eta_2 = \frac{c_2 - 2 + \sqrt{9c_2^2 - 8c_2}}{2}.$$

Since $c_2 > 1$, we have $\eta_1 < 0$ and $\eta_2 > 0$, which show that the equilibrium point is of the type saddle $\times$ center $\times$ center. Let $\omega_y \equiv \sqrt{-\eta_1}$, $\lambda_x = \sqrt{\eta_2}$; according to

[5, 13], we proceed to implement a symplectic change of variables, such that the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian is finally diagonalized as

$$H_2^{(d)}(p_1, p_2, p_3, q_1, q_2, q_3) = \lambda_x q_1 p_1 + i\omega_y q_2 p_2 + i\omega_z q_3 p_3, \quad (8)$$

where we denote by $(p, q) = (p_1, p_2, p_3, q_1, q_2, q_3)$ the new diagonalizing variables.

3.2. Resonant normalization

Given the saddle $\times$ center $\times$ center character of the equilibria as shown in Section 3.1, the center manifold reduction consists in focussing the study to the center directions and in eliminating the hyperbolic component. Actually, we can perform the center manifold reduction by first constructing the normal form through a suitable canonical transformation, which is obtained by means of Lie series, and then by choosing appropriate initial conditions on the invariant center manifold admitted by the normal form dynamics. We refer to this procedure as the *direct method*.

We start by expressing the Hamiltonian (3) in terms of the diagonalizing variables, so that we obtain the Hamiltonian

$$H^{(d)}(p_1, p_2, p_3, q_1, q_2, q_3) = \sum_{n \geq 2} H_n^{(d)}(p, q), \quad (9)$$

where $H_2^{(d)}$ is given by (8) and $H_n^{(d)}$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree n . Next we proceed to perform a resonant perturbation theory in the neighborhood of the synchronous resonance $\omega_y = \omega_z$ (see [4, 8]) by constructing a canonical transformation, $(p, q) \rightarrow (P, Q)$, which conjugates (9) to the form:

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(NF)}(P_1, P_2, P_3, Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) &= \lambda_x Q_1 P_1 + i\omega_y Q_2 P_2 + i\omega_z Q_3 P_3 \\ &+ \sum_{n=3}^N K_n^{(NF)}(Q_1 P_1, P_2, P_3, Q_2, Q_3) + R_{N+1}(P, Q), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the homogeneous polynomials $K_n^{(NF)}$, $n = 3, \dots, N$, are in *normal form* with respect to the (synchronous) resonant quadratic part $K_2^{(NF)} = H_2^{(r)}$ with $H_2^{(r)}$ given by

$$H_2^{(r)}(P_1, P_2, P_3, Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) \equiv \lambda_x Q_1 P_1 + i\omega_z (Q_2 P_2 + Q_3 P_3) \quad (11)$$

and $R_{N+1}(P, Q)$ is a remainder function of degree $N + 1$. By *normal form* we mean that each term up to order N in the series (10) satisfies the condition

$$\{H_2^{(r)}, K_n^{(NF)}\} = 0,$$

where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ denotes the Poisson brackets. The resonant quadratic Hamiltonian in (11), $H_2^{(r)}(P_1, P_2, P_3, Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$, is obtained from the original quadratic part in (8), expressed in the new variables and modified in order to be resonant in the elliptic

components. We can justify this assumption by observing that, for any $\mu \in (0, 1/2]$ the two elliptic frequencies are such that the quantity

$$\delta \equiv \omega_y - \omega_z ,$$

to which we refer as the *detuning*, is always a small quantity (in our examples it will be of the order of 10^{-2}). The detuning provides a measure of the distance in the frequency from the synchronous resonance. In this way, even if the unperturbed system is strictly not resonant, we are able to describe the resonant dynamics of the perturbed system determined by the nonlinear coupling. The detuning parameter will be used to obtain series expansions of indicators, such as the bifurcation thresholds to halo orbits.

Since the normalization involving the hyperbolic components is a standard Birkhoff normalization, the normal form depends on Q_1, P_1 only through their product, while the remainder $R_{N+1}(P, Q)$ might depend on Q_1, P_1 separately.

3.3. Center manifold reduction

For convenience, we implement the change of variables

$$\begin{cases} Q_1 = \sqrt{I_x} e^{\theta_x} \\ Q_2 = \sqrt{I_y} (\sin \theta_y - i \cos \theta_y) = -i \sqrt{I_y} e^{i\theta_y} \\ Q_3 = \sqrt{I_z} (\sin \theta_z - i \cos \theta_z) = -i \sqrt{I_z} e^{i\theta_z} \\ P_1 = \sqrt{I_x} e^{-\theta_x} \\ P_2 = \sqrt{I_y} (\cos \theta_y - i \sin \theta_y) = \sqrt{I_y} e^{-i\theta_y} \\ P_3 = \sqrt{I_z} (\cos \theta_z - i \sin \theta_z) = \sqrt{I_z} e^{-i\theta_z} . \end{cases}$$

From the structure of the normal form Hamiltonian (10) we see that the *action* variable $I_x = Q_1 P_1$ is a constant of motion, whenever the remainder is neglected. Therefore, given an initial condition $I_x(0) = 0$ and neglecting R_{N+1} , we obtain an integrable Hamiltonian in two degrees of freedom (hereafter, DOF), which provides the dynamics in the center manifold up to an approximation of order N . Within the center manifold, we describe the motion by the following 2-DOF Hamiltonian in action–angle variables:

$$K^{(CM)}(I_y, I_z, \theta_y, \theta_z) = K_0(I_y, I_z) + K_r(I_y, I_z, \theta_y - \theta_z) + R^{(r)}(I_y, I_z, \theta_y, \theta_z) , \quad (12)$$

where K_0 depends only on the actions; K_r is the resonant part depending on the actions as well as on the angles, but just through the combination $\theta_y - \theta_z$, which corresponds to the synchronous resonance; $R^{(r)}$ represents the reduced remainder function. This procedure leads to have, by construction, that $\dot{I}_y + \dot{I}_z = 0$ up to the remainder.

3.4. The indirect method

An alternative approach to the normalization (Section 3.2) and center manifold reduction (Section 3.3) has been adopted in [5] on the basis of [13]. It consists in splitting the above procedure in two steps: a preliminary transformation to get a Hamiltonian in which only terms which do not contain integer powers of the product $Q_1 P_1$ are eliminated, and a subsequent resonant normalization. We refer to this procedure as the *indirect method*.

It can be verified that this procedure coincides with that described above only at the first order in the resonant term. From the second order on, the two procedures provide different results on which we will comment later on.

4. Analytical estimates of the bifurcation values

In this section we provide a method to give an analytical estimate of the value at which a bifurcation to halo orbits occurs. We describe in Section 4.1 the method based on a normalization to first order, while in Section 4.2 we extend the method using a second order normal form. Of course the method can be implemented to higher orders (see Section 4.3); however, one should keep in mind that Birkhoff's normalization admits an optimal order, which provides the best result. We recall that, for divergent asymptotic series (as the Birkhoff normal form usually is), an optimal order is reached when partial sums of the remainder series have a minimum [7]. In practice, it is not trivial to understand which is the best order of normalization, especially when dealing with peculiar cases like that of L_3 for small values of the mass ratio of the primaries (see Section 5).

4.1. First-order theory

The model problem given in Section 2 is characterized by just one parameter, the mass ratio μ . Therefore, all coefficients appearing in the Hamiltonian and its integrable approximation should be expressed in terms of such parameter. The explicit computation of these coefficients is however quite difficult, mostly in view of the following two facts:

1. The distances γ_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$, of the collinear equilibria from the closest primary are the solutions of the fifth order Euler's equations and therefore cannot be easily expressed in terms of μ ; this difficulty propagates through the coefficients $c_n(\mu)$ of the expansion in the Hamiltonian (3).
2. The diagonalizing transformation simplifies the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian, but scrambles its higher-order terms determining complicated expressions for the coefficients in the normal form.

We may try to circumvent the first problem by exploiting a series expansion of the γ_j in terms of the mass ratio, by means of which one may hope to get explicit results valid in the limit of a small mass ratio. About the second problem there is little to do, except to compute the normalizing transformation after a generic linear transformation and, only in the end, to substitute the explicit diagonalizing transformation. In doing so, already the second-order normal form contains coefficients

for which an explicit algebraic representation is quite cumbersome. Therefore, in Appendix A, we provide just the expression of the coefficients of the normal form Hamiltonian truncated to the first order. In this way we get explicit analytic first-order formulae which happen to be quite useful, especially for L_1 (see Figure 1 below and the results presented in Section 5.4).

To obtain an overall picture of the results, we compute the second-order (and higher-order) normal form only for a finite number of mass ratios in the whole range $0 < \mu \leq 1/2$ by firstly substituting the mass parameter in the original Hamiltonian and, afterwards, by normalizing with numerical coefficients. By proceeding in this semi-analytical way, it is a simpler matter to reach very high orders. This procedure works very well as it is confirmed by the comparison between some available numerical experiments and the analytic first-order results. First-order thresholds, being a rough approximation, are obviously less accurate but, by using the quantities of Appendix A, any value of μ can be chosen and results can be obtained without the need of recomputing the normal form. The only case in which problems appear is that of L_3 in the limit of small mass-ratios, see Section 5.2 below.

Truncating the normal form whenever the first resonant terms appear can be considered a *first-order* resonant perturbation approach. From the order of the resonance generated by (11) it is straightforward to check that the odd degree terms in the normal form vanish and that the first non-trivial term is $K_4^{(NF)}$. Therefore, truncating (12) to degree two in the actions leads to the following first-order normal form:

$$K^{(CM,1)}(I_y, I_z, \theta_y, \theta_z) = \omega_y I_y + \omega_z I_z + [\alpha I_y^2 + \beta I_z^2 + I_y I_z (\sigma + 2\tau \cos(2(\theta_y - \theta_z)))] \quad (13)$$

with suitable coefficients $\alpha, \beta, \sigma, \tau$, whose explicit expressions are given in Appendix A.

We immediately remark that, if either I_y or I_z vanish, one obtains the nonlinear *normal modes*, namely

$$E_y \equiv \omega_y I_y + \alpha I_y^2,$$

and

$$E_z \equiv \omega_z I_z + \beta I_z^2.$$

Denoting by

$$\mathcal{E} = I_y + I_z \quad (14)$$

the conserved quantity (the *second integral*) resulting from the normalization, the theory developed in [19, 24, 5] based on the reduction to a 1-DOF system, allows us to describe the main features of the dynamics provided by (13).

Here we briefly sketch the essentials of the theory. By reduced 1-DOF system

we mean the following. Let us make the change of variables (compare with (14)):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E} &= I_y + I_z \\ \mathcal{R} &= I_y \\ \mathbf{v} &= \theta_z \\ \psi &= \theta_y - \theta_z .\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

Then, the Hamiltonian (13) is transformed into

$$K^{(R1)}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}, \mathbf{v}, \psi) = \omega_z \mathcal{E} + \delta \mathcal{R} + a \mathcal{R}^2 + b \mathcal{E}^2 + c \mathcal{E} \mathcal{R} + d(\mathcal{R}^2 - \mathcal{E} \mathcal{R}) \cos(2\psi) ,\tag{16}$$

where the constants are defined as follows: $a = \alpha + \beta - \sigma$, $b = \beta$, $c = \sigma - 2\beta$, $d = -2\tau$. Hamilton's equations associated to (16) take the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathcal{E}} &= 0 \\ \dot{\mathcal{R}} &= 2d\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{E}) \sin(2\psi) \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}} &= \omega_z + 2b\mathcal{E} + c\mathcal{R} - d\mathcal{R} \cos(2\psi) \\ \dot{\psi} &= \delta + 2a\mathcal{R} + c\mathcal{E} + d(2\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{E}) \cos(2\psi) .\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

Therefore we obtain a 1-DOF system in the phase-plane $(\mathcal{R}, \psi)$, parametrized by $\mathcal{E}$. Its equilibria correspond to periodic orbits of the original 2-DOF system.

From the equation $\dot{\mathcal{R}} = 0$, we obtain a first set of solutions valid for any $\psi \in \mathbb{T}$: it consists just of the normal modes $\mathcal{R} = 0$, $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{E}$. From the coupled equations $\dot{\mathcal{R}} = 0$, $\dot{\psi} = 0$, a second set (the *periodic orbits in general position*) is given by a solution $\mathcal{R}_i$ associated to the resonant combination $\psi = 0, \pi$ and by a solution $\mathcal{R}_\ell$ with $\psi = \pm\pi/2$. The equilibrium points $(\mathcal{R}_i, 0)$ and $(\mathcal{R}_i, \pi)$ correspond to the so-called *inclined* periodic orbits while the equilibrium points $(\mathcal{R}_\ell, \pm\pi/2)$ correspond to *loop* orbits. These periodic orbits arise as bifurcations from the normal modes when the following existence conditions are satisfied

$$0 \leq \mathcal{R}_i, \mathcal{R}_\ell \leq \mathcal{E} .$$

Loops bifurcating from the $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{E}$ normal mode are precisely what we usually call halo orbits.

These conditions provide the following constraints for the existence of resonant orbits bifurcating from the normal modes:

$$\mathcal{E} \geq \mathcal{E}_{ly} \equiv \frac{\delta}{\sigma - 2(\alpha + \tau)} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{E} \geq \mathcal{E}_{lz} \equiv \frac{\delta}{2(\beta + \tau) - \sigma} \tag{18}$$

for the halo family (namely loops, with fixed phase relation $\theta_y - \theta_z = 0, \pi$) and

$$\mathcal{E} \geq \mathcal{E}_{iy} \equiv \frac{\delta}{\sigma - 2(\alpha - \tau)} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{E} \geq \mathcal{E}_{iz} \equiv \frac{\delta}{2(\beta - \tau) - \sigma} \tag{19}$$

for the *anti-halo* family (that is, the inclined with the fixed phase relation $\theta_y - \theta_z = \pm\pi/2$). The first of (18) is just the occurrence of the bifurcation of the halo family

from the planar Lyapunov orbit, which becomes unstable. A second bifurcation may occur at the value given by the first of (19), when the Lyapunov orbit regains stability. An alternative computation of the thresholds based on Floquet theory is presented in Section 4.4.

To determine the energy level at which the bifurcation takes place, we write the threshold value of the integral $\mathcal{E}$ as a power series in δ and we denote by $\mathcal{E}_N$ a truncation of the series up to an integer order N , say

$$\mathcal{E}_N = \sum_{k=1}^N C_k \delta^k \quad (20)$$

for suitable real coefficients C_k . Notice that, due to the form of (18) and (19), it is reasonable to start the series in (20) with the first order in δ . Then, we look for a relation on the bifurcating normal mode between $\mathcal{E}$ and E , that is the energy associated to the Hamiltonian (3). The estimate to first order is simply

$$E_1 = \omega_z \mathcal{E}_1 = \omega_z C_1 \delta ,$$

which, coming back to the original coefficients, gives the bifurcation value

$$E_1 = \frac{\omega_z \delta}{\sigma - 2(\alpha + \tau)} . \quad (21)$$

A nice feature of the first-order theory is that, given the coefficients of the normal form (13), all dynamical quantities can be formally explicitly computed. For example, a first order estimate of the frequency of the normal modes (Lyapunov orbits) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_y^{(1)} &= \omega_y + 2\alpha \mathcal{E} , \\ \kappa_z^{(1)} &= \omega_z + 2\beta \mathcal{E} . \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, the computation of the variational frequency of orthogonal perturbations of the normal modes can be performed (see [24]) starting from the *reduced frequency* associated to the 1-DOF dynamics. For the variational frequency of the horizontal normal mode $\kappa_y^{(HNM)}$, we obtain the following expression

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_y^{(HNM)} &= \sqrt{4\tau^2 \mathcal{E}^2 - [(2\alpha - \sigma)\mathcal{E} + \delta]^2} \\ &= \sqrt{(\mathcal{E}_{iy} - \mathcal{E})(\mathcal{E}_{ly} - \mathcal{E})} \sqrt{(2\alpha - \sigma)^2 - 4\tau^2} , \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

which gives the *rotation number*

$$\rho = \frac{\kappa_y^{(HNM)}}{\kappa_y^{(1)}} , \quad (23)$$

providing information about the stability of the normal perturbation. Comparing (22) with the first expressions in (19) and (18), we see that the frequency is real (and that the normal mode, namely the planar Lyapunov orbit, is stable) for $\mathcal{E} < \mathcal{E}_{ly}$ and for $\mathcal{E} > \mathcal{E}_{iy}$. In the range $\mathcal{E}_{ly} < \mathcal{E} < \mathcal{E}_{iy}$ the inverse of the positive value of (22) gives the rate of growth of the perturbation.

4.2. Second order theory

To get a higher order estimate of the bifurcation value, we need an explicit expression of the perturbing function to sixth order. To this end, we reduce also the term $K_6^{(NF)}$ to the center manifold and we implement perturbation theory. Again we obtain that the order five does not contribute to the average as well as to the resonant part, while at order six we obtain the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(CM,2)}(I_y, I_z, \theta_y, \theta_z) &= \omega_y I_y + \omega_z I_z + \alpha I_y^2 + \beta I_z^2 + I_y I_z (\sigma + 2\tau \cos(2(\theta_y - \theta_z))) \\ &+ \alpha_{3300} I_y^3 + \alpha_{0033} I_z^3 + \alpha_{1122} I_y I_z^2 + \alpha_{2211} I_y^2 I_z \\ &+ 2I_y I_z [\alpha_{2013} I_z + \alpha_{3102} I_y] \cos(2(\theta_y - \theta_z)) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

for suitable coefficients α_{abcd} with $a + b + c + d = 6$.

The procedure to get the second order estimate has been illustrated in [5]: we remark that the results of Section 4.1 have the same precision of the equilibria of the linearised system. In the framework of a second order theory, the equilibria result from quadratic equations. Following [16], rather than computing exact solutions for these equations, it is better to get solutions in terms of series in the detuning, truncated at the same order as the normal form. The second order bifurcation value turns out to be

$$\mathcal{E}_2 = \mathcal{E}_1 - \frac{\alpha_{2211} - 3\alpha_{3300} - 2\alpha_{3102}}{(\sigma - 2(\alpha + \tau))^3} \delta^2, \quad (25)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_1 = \delta/(\sigma - 2(\alpha + \tau))$. To convert this result in terms of the energy, the following second order expression for the energy of the normal mode is necessary:

$$E = (\omega_z + \delta) \mathcal{E} + \alpha \mathcal{E}^2.$$

Using (25), we get the bifurcation energy of the halo at second order as

$$E_2 = E_1 + \left[\frac{\sigma - \alpha - 2\tau}{(\sigma - 2(\alpha + \tau))^2} - \omega_z \frac{\alpha_{2211} - 3\alpha_{3300} - 2\alpha_{3102}}{(\sigma - 2(\alpha + \tau))^3} \right] \delta^2. \quad (26)$$

We remark that the formal structure of (24) is the same both in the *direct* normalization method (DM in the following) of Section 3.2 and in the *indirect* method (hereafter IM) adopted in [5] (see Section 3.4).

4.3. Higher order theory

A prediction based on an N -th order normal form can be obtained by a suitable extension of the theory ([16, 20]). The Hamiltonian on the center manifold is of the form

$$\tilde{K}^{(CM,N)}(P_1, Q_1, P_2, P_3, Q_2, Q_3) = \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{K}_{2n}^{(NF)}(0, P_2, P_3, Q_2, Q_3) \quad (27)$$

for suitable polynomials $\tilde{K}_{2n}^{(NF)}$ of degree $2n$ in the variables (P_2, P_3, Q_2, Q_3) : the symmetric 1:1 resonant normal form only admits even degree terms. The equilibria of its reduced counterpart can be found by solving an N -th degree algebraic

equation. The existence condition turns out in a solution of the form (20). To convert the result in terms of the energy, an N -th order expression for the energy on the normal mode is necessary:

$$E = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \mathcal{E}^n \quad (28)$$

for suitable real coefficients a_n . Plugging (20) into (28) with $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_N$, one obtains a series in δ . Truncating such series to order N , we get an approximate value of the bifurcation energy of the halo orbit as

$$E_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{C}_n |\delta|^n ,$$

where the $\hat{C}_n$ are rational combinations of the coefficients of the normal form. An optimal order of truncation of the procedure can be obtained by looking for the order giving the best asymptotic convergence of the series.

4.4. A first-order estimate based on Floquet theory

In this Section we give an alternative derivation of the stability/instability transition of the normal modes (planar and vertical Lyapunov families) on the basis of the Floquet theory (see, e.g., [26]). With reference to (13), we start by considering small variations around the planar Lyapunov orbit $I_z = 0$. For our purposes, the easiest way to proceed suggests to employ *complex-conjugate* variables in order to represent small variations around the normal mode. Therefore, instead of the (I_z, θ_z) variables used before, we introduce the coordinates (z, w) defined as

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \sqrt{2I_z} e^{-i\theta_z} , \\ w &= -\sqrt{2I_z} e^{i\theta_z} . \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$T_y = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa_y}, \quad \kappa_y \in \mathbb{R},$$

be the period of the normal mode corresponding to the planar Lyapunov orbit. The periodic oscillation on the normal mode is given by (see Section 4.1)

$$I_y = I, \quad \theta_y = \theta = \kappa_y t, \quad \kappa_y = \omega_y + 2\alpha I. \quad (29)$$

Since $\omega_y = \omega_z + \delta$, the Hamiltonian (13) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(CM,1)}(z, w, I, \theta) &= \omega_z \left(I + \frac{zw}{2} \right) + \delta I + \\ &\quad \left[\alpha I^2 + \frac{\beta}{4} z^2 w^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2} I z w - \frac{\tau}{2} I \left(z^2 e^{2i\theta} + w^2 e^{-2i\theta} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The equations of motion associated to (30) can be written in almost canonical form as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{I} &= -\frac{\partial K^{(CM,1)}}{\partial \theta}, & \dot{\theta} &= \frac{\partial K^{(CM,1)}}{\partial I} \\ \dot{z} &= 2i\frac{\partial K^{(CM,1)}}{\partial w}, & \dot{w} &= -2i\frac{\partial K^{(CM,1)}}{\partial z}. \end{aligned}$$

We now exploit the integral of motion

$$\mathcal{E} = I + \frac{zw}{2} \quad (31)$$

to study the variational dynamics on the *energy shell*: this is equivalent to the use of the Lagrange multiplier as in [26]. From (31), we can substitute $\mathcal{E} - zw/2$ in place of I in (30) and truncate up to second order in the small quantities z, w , thus obtaining the time-periodic 1DOF Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(CM,2)}(z, w, \theta; \mathcal{E}) &= (\omega_z + \delta)\mathcal{E} + \alpha\mathcal{E}^2 - (\delta + (2\alpha - \sigma)\mathcal{E})\frac{zw}{2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\tau}{2}\mathcal{E}\left(z^2 e^{2i\theta} + w^2 e^{-2i\theta}\right), \end{aligned}$$

in which $\mathcal{E}$ is considered as a constant parameter. We then pass to *corotating coordinates* (Z, W) (see [2]) by means of the transformation

$$Z = ze^{i\theta}, \quad W = we^{-i\theta},$$

leading to the quadratic Hamiltonian

$$K(Z, W) = -(\delta + (2\alpha - \sigma)\mathcal{E})\frac{ZW}{2} - \frac{\tau}{2}\mathcal{E}(Z^2 + W^2),$$

where constant terms have been neglected. Introducing the *Floquet matrix*

$$F \equiv -i \begin{pmatrix} \delta + (2\alpha - \sigma)\mathcal{E} & 2\tau\mathcal{E} \\ -2\tau\mathcal{E} & -\delta - (2\alpha - \sigma)\mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

the canonical equations take the linear form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{Z} \\ \dot{W} \end{pmatrix} = F \begin{pmatrix} Z \\ W \end{pmatrix}.$$

The corresponding solution is governed by the *fundamental matrix* $\exp(tF)$, so that the solution for the original complex orbital variations can be written in the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} z(t) \\ w(t) \end{pmatrix} = M(t) \begin{pmatrix} z(0) \\ w(0) \end{pmatrix},$$

where, using (29), it is

$$\begin{aligned} M(t) &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \exp(tF) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\kappa_y t} \left(\cos \lambda t + \frac{F_{11}}{\lambda} \sin \lambda t \right) & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\kappa_y t} \left(\cos \lambda t - \frac{F_{11}}{\lambda} \sin \lambda t \right) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

with $\pm\lambda$ the eigenvalues of the Floquet matrix F .

The *monodromy* matrix is finally defined as

$$M(T_y) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos 2\pi \frac{\lambda}{\kappa_y} + \frac{F_{11}}{\lambda} \sin 2\pi \frac{\lambda}{\kappa_y} & 0 \\ 0 & \cos 2\pi \frac{\lambda}{\kappa_y} - \frac{F_{11}}{\lambda} \sin 2\pi \frac{\lambda}{\kappa_y} \end{pmatrix}.$$

where we denoted by T_y the period of the normal mode. The transition from stability to instability or viceversa is given by the condition

$$\text{Trace}(M(T_y)) = 2 \cos 2\pi \frac{\lambda}{\kappa_y} = 2,$$

which corresponds to $\lambda = 0$. An explicit computation of the eigenvalues λ and of the solution $\lambda = 0$ using the components of the matrix (32) gives the threshold values

$$\mathcal{E}_{\ell y} = \frac{\delta}{\sigma - 2(\alpha + \tau)}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{iy} = \frac{\delta}{\sigma - 2(\alpha - \tau)},$$

which coincide with those obtained by examining the conditions for the existence of the critical points of the reduced Hamiltonian (compare with Section 4.1).

By following an analogous procedure, one can analyze the stability transitions of the *vertical normal mode*: in this case, the periodic oscillation on the normal mode is given by

$$I_z = I, \quad \theta_z = \kappa_z t, \quad \kappa_z = \omega_z + 2\beta I$$

and the Floquet matrix is

$$F \equiv i \begin{pmatrix} \delta - (2\beta - \sigma)\mathcal{E} & -2\tau\mathcal{E} \\ 2\tau\mathcal{E} & -\delta + (2\beta - \sigma)\mathcal{E} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The conditions for vanishing of its eigenvalues now give the threshold values

$$\mathcal{E}_{iz} = \frac{\delta}{2(\beta - \tau) - \sigma}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{\ell z} = \frac{\delta}{2(\beta + \tau) - \sigma},$$

again in agreement with the results of Section 4.1.

5. Results

In this section we present an overview of the results by comparing the analytical estimates obtained in Section 4 with the numerical values available in the literature ([14, 15, 10, 11]) or by private communications ([12]). Due to the peculiarity of L_3 with respect to the other collinear points, we split the discussion, devoting Section 5.1 to the analysis of the results for L_1 and L_2 , while Section 5.2 provides the results concerning L_3 . A discussion of the small mass limit for L_1 and L_2 is presented in Section 5.4, while small mass ratios for L_3 are described in Section 5.5. Precisely, we shall call *Hill's case*, the case of L_1 and L_2 when μ tends to zero, since it is equivalent to let one of the primaries tend to infinity as in the classical lunar theory studied by G. Hill in [17]. When dealing with L_3 , we shall refer to the case $\mu \rightarrow 0$ as the *quasi-Kepler* problem, since it corresponds to a nearly two-body problem in rotating coordinates ([28]).

5.1. Bifurcation thresholds for L_1 and L_2

A comparison of the results between the analytical estimates at different orders and the available numerical values ([14, 15, 10, 11, 12]) are displayed in Tables 1–3; in this section we concentrate on the collinear points L_1 (Table 1) and L_2 (Table 2), while Section 5.2 will be devoted to L_3 .

The numerical evaluation of the bifurcation thresholds in the limit of very small mass-ratio $\mu \rightarrow 0$, the so-called Hill's case, and that of equal masses ($\mu = 1/2$) has been performed by M. Hénon ([14]) in his seminal works on the investigation of periodic orbits in the framework of the circular, spatial, restricted three-body problem. Beside Hill's and the equal masses cases, we consider also two intermediate examples: the barycenter–Sun and the Earth–Moon cases. For these two systems the numerical data have been remarkably obtained in [10, 11, 12]. We recall that the barycenter–Sun case is provided by the gravitational attraction between the Earth–Moon barycenter and the Sun.

As far as the analytical estimates are concerned, the first-order predictions have been computed by using formula (21), while the second-order predictions are obtained via (26) by using the normal form coefficients computed with the direct method (DM) and the indirect one (IM); in order to ease the comparison with numerical data, we compute the values of the *physical* bifurcation energy, obtained by implementing the conversion formulae (4–6).

We also report the results obtained computing the normal form at higher orders, up to the sixth order (which corresponds to degree 7 in the actions). The number of digits reported in Tables 1 and 2 is dictated by the asymptotic value at which an approximate convergence is attained. We stress that the numerical results provided in the last line of Tables 1, 2, 3 are given up to the 5th decimal digit as in [11].

From the analysis of the data in Table 1 we infer that we obtain a very good agreement between the analytical predictions and the numerical data. The theoretical results improve as the order of normalization increases, reaching a reasonable

	Hill's case	barycenter–Sun	Earth–Moon	equal masses
	$\mu \rightarrow 0$	$\mu = \mu_{bS}$	$\mu = \mu_{EM}$	$\mu = 1/2$
First order	-1.500000	-1.500415	-1.587193	-1.961675
Second order (IM)	-1.500000	-1.500417	-1.587175	-1.961535
Second order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500417	-1.587175	-1.961534
Third order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500416	-1.587176	-1.961536
Fourth order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500416	-1.587176	-1.961536
Fifth order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500416	-1.587176	-1.961536
Sixth order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500416	-1.587176	-1.961536
Numerical	-1.50000	-1.50042	-1.58718	-1.96154

Table 1: Results for the analytical bifurcation estimates for L_1 up to a normal form of order 6 and the numerical values obtained in [14, 15, 10, 11], physical energy, see (4); the values of the mass ratios are $\mu_{bS} = 3.0404326 \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mu_{EM} = 0.01215058$.

agreement with the numerical value (up to the 5th or even the 6th decimal place) at the fifth order of normalization in the whole range of masses.

	Hill's case	barycenter–Sun	Earth–Moon	equal masses
	$\mu \rightarrow 0$	$\mu = \mu_{bS}$	$\mu = \mu_{EM}$	$\mu = 1/2$
First order	-1.500000	-1.500412	-1.575838	-1.524509
Second order (IM)	-1.500000	-1.500413	-1.576065	-1.552699
Second order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500413	-1.576087	-1.548191
Third order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500413	-1.576055	-1.543863
Fourth order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500413	-1.576060	-1.544834
Fifth order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500413	-1.576060	-1.544864
Sixth order (DM)	-1.500000	-1.500413	-1.576060	-1.544820
Numerical	-1.50000	-1.50041	-1.57606	-1.54476

Table 2: Results for the analytical bifurcation estimates for L_2 up to a normal form of order 6 and the numerical values obtained in [14, 15, 11, 12], physical energy, see (5); the values of the mass ratios are $\mu_{bS} = 3.0404326 \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mu_{EM} = 0.01215058$.

Quite similarly, the values shown in Table 2 referring to the collinear point L_2 show a good agreement between the analytical and numerical results. Again we find that, with the exception of the case with $\mu = 1/2$ with a discrepancy on the 5th digit, the 5th or 6th decimal digit is typically reached at the fifth order of normalization.

To have a global view, we proceed to compute several values of the bifurcation threshold as a function of the mass ratio of the primaries and then we interpolate the results. Precisely, the bifurcation thresholds in the rescaled energy, obtained by (26) using the normal form coefficients computed with the direct method, are




Figure 1: Bifurcation thresholds computed via (26) as a function of the mass ratio: L_1 (blue), L_2 (red), L_3 (green). The dashed red and blue curves provide the bifurcation thresholds obtained through (48) and (41) below. The dot-dashed part referring to L_3 corresponds to results obtained when the normal form has already reached the optimal order.

plotted for the whole interval of definition of μ in Figure 1, where the curves are obtained interpolating 20 points. The blue and red curves refer respectively to L_1 and L_2 : the continuous curves are based on the second-order theory, the dashed ones on the first-order theory (see also Section 5.4 below). The vertical lines mark the three reference cases: the barycenter–Sun, the Earth–Moon and the equal-mass values. The circles denote the numerical data reported in the tables.

In view of concrete applications, we find it convenient to give also the initial values of $X_0, \dot{Y}_0$ as a function of μ , which correspond to the bifurcations of the halo orbits. We notice that the plots presented in Figure 2 are in substantial agreement with the values reported in [14, 15, 18].

5.2. Bifurcation thresholds for L_3

The dynamics around L_3 presents some difficulties, especially in the limit of small masses, in view of the degeneracy of the problem and the smallness of the perturbation. Even on the numerical side it is not easy to obtain accurate simulations. In fact, Figure 1 provides the bifurcation threshold of L_3 for different values of μ (green line). However, we need to split the interpolating curve in two parts: the continuous line (from high values to about $\log_{10}(\mu) = -2$) corresponds to the parameter region in which the normal form is computed at orders below the optimal one, while the dot-dashed part of the curve corresponds to results for which the normal form has already reached the optimal order. We specify that in this framework by *optimal order* we mean the order at which we get the best agreement with the numerical threshold. In subsection 5.3 we investigate the problem of the




Figure 2: Initial values for X (left panels) and $\dot{Y}$ (right panels) of the *first* halo orbits as a function of the mass ratio for L_1 (upper panels) and L_2 (lower panels).

convergence of the normal form obtaining a more rigorous estimate of the optimal order. In the prototypical Earth-Moon case, these results confirm that the second-order evaluation of the threshold is the best at this mass-ratio (with a relative error $\simeq 10^{-2}$) and rapidly deteriorates with decreasing mass. Overall, by looking at Table 3 we see how the situation be definitely worse than for L_1 and L_2 . In fact, reasonable results are obtained only for mass values $\mu > 10^{-2}$, say bigger than the Earth-Moon case, while for smaller masses the approach seems to fail. The prediction for the barycenter-Sun case (-1.40804 , a value kindly provided in [12]) is drastically overestimated.

In our analytical approach the construction of the normal form for L_3 is obtained through the same procedure as for the other points L_1 and L_2 . It is important to stress that for L_3 the indirect method fails in providing a reliable prediction already at μ around 0.1 , when it starts to give divergent values of the threshold. The reason for this phenomenon is the following: in the transformation which aims only at eliminating from the Hamiltonian those terms which do not satisfy the condition to be proportional to $(P_1 Q_1)^k$, only the terms with *small divisors* dominated by λ_x have an important rôle. These terms appear in the generating function already at the first order, thus affecting the normal form constructed in the indirect way. Since it can be proven (see Section 5.4) that λ_x goes to zero with the square root of μ , there are divergent terms affecting the convergence of the indirect normal form. These terms are absent by construction in the normal form obtained with the direct method. We will come back on these issues in Section 5.5 below.

	quasi-Kepler	barycenter–Sun	Earth–Moon	equal masses
	$\mu \rightarrow 0$	$\mu = \mu_{bS}$	$\mu = \mu_{EM}$	$\mu = 1/2$
First order	-1.178200	-1.178102	-1.175384	-1.524509
Second order (IM)	–	–	–	-1.552699
Second order (DM)	-1.220215	-1.219855	-1.223564	-1.548191
Third order (DM)	–	–	-1.147760	-1.543863
Fourth order (DM)	–	–	-1.018562	-1.544834
Fifth order (DM)	–	–	-1.816723	-1.544864
Sixth order (DM)	–	–	32.782497	-1.544820
Numerical	–	-1.40804	-1.21177	-1.54476

Table 3: Results for the analytical bifurcation estimates for L_3 up to a normal form of order 6 and the numerical values obtained in [14, 11, 12], physical energy, see (4); the values of the mass ratios are $\mu_{bS} = 3.0404326 \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mu_{EM} = 0.01215058$.

5.3. On the asymptotic convergence of the normal form

A relevant question concerns the discussion of the asymptotic convergence of the normal form series. A first information is given by looking at the Tables 1, 2, 3, which show a striking agreement of predicted and experimental data in the cases of L_1 and L_2 , while the optimal order of truncation seems to coincide with the second one in case of L_3 . As already implemented in [13], an estimate of the radius of asymptotic convergence of the normal form series is provided by the classical root and ratio criterions, that we are going to apply as follows.

Making reference to the Hamiltonian (27), we compute the norm of the coefficients $\tilde{K}_n^{(NF)}(0, P_2, P_3, Q_2, Q_3)$. Assuming that such terms $\tilde{K}_n^{(NF)}$ can be expanded as

$$\tilde{K}_n^{(NF)}(0, P_2, P_3, Q_2, Q_3) = \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} h_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^{(n)} P_2^{j_1} P_3^{j_2} Q_2^{j_3} Q_3^{j_4}$$

for some complex coefficients $h_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^{(n)}$, then their norm is defined as

$$\|\tilde{K}_n^{(NF)}\| = \sum_{|j_1|+|j_2|+|j_3|+|j_4|=n} |h_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4}^{(n)}|.$$

Next, we implement the root criterion by computing the quantity

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{root} = \sqrt[n]{\|\tilde{K}_n^{(NF)}\|}. \quad (33)$$

In a similar way, we implement the ratio criterion by computing the quantity

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{ratio} = \frac{\|\tilde{K}_n^{(NF)}\|}{\|\tilde{K}_{n-1}^{(NF)}\|}. \quad (34)$$

Figure 3 provides an example of the implementation of the root and ratio criterions for the Earth–Moon case. We recall that the sixth order normal form corresponds to




Figure 3: Root criterion (blue dots) and ratio criterion (red dots) for the Earth-Moon case for L_1 (upper panel), L_2 (middle panel), L_3 (lower panel). The abscissa provides the order of normalization, while the ordinate yields the quantities in (33) and (34).

a computation up to degree 7 in the actions. For the collinear points L_1 and L_2 we have evidence of an agreement with the numerical values which is still improving at order 6. As expected, the case of L_3 shows a peculiar behavior in agreement with the result provided in Table 3, according to which the optimal order of truncation is very low, possibly coinciding with the second order.

5.4. Recovering the limit of small masses via the Hill's case: analytic first-order expressions.

The case in which the mass ratio tends to zero corresponds, for L_1, L_2 , to the so-called Hill's case [17, 15]. We stress that this system, the simplest version of the CSR3BP, has been rigorously proved to be non-integrable [21].

We recall that we may expand the distances γ_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$, in series of μ according to the expressions [4]:

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{3^{1/3}} \left(\frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \right)^{1/3} - \frac{1}{3 \times 3^{2/3}} \left(\frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \right)^{2/3} - \frac{1}{27} \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} + O\left(\left(\frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \right)^{4/3} \right)$$

for L_1 and

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{3^{1/3}} \left(\frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \right)^{1/3} + \frac{1}{3 \times 3^{2/3}} \left(\frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \right)^{2/3} + \frac{1}{27} \frac{\mu}{1-\mu} + O\left(\left(\frac{\mu}{1-\mu} \right)^{4/3} \right)$$

for L_2 .

For L_1 and L_2 we get therefore an explicit evaluation of the first-order threshold (21) by using the coefficients reported in Appendix A. For L_1 we get the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \alpha_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \alpha_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= -0.0956176 - 0.22769 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.239225 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} - 0.116094 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \beta_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \beta_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= -0.0775862 - 0.230678 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.245705 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} - 0.100155 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \sigma_0 + \sigma_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \sigma_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \sigma_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= 0.0306614 - 0.341373 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.437685 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} - 0.163686 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \tau_0 + \tau_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \tau_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \tau_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= -0.101288 - 0.0583243 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.0245161 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} - 0.0254687 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &= \delta_0 + \delta_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \delta_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \delta_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= 0.0715942 - 0.0240373 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.0150446 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + 0.0210766 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}),\end{aligned}\quad (39)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_z &= \omega_{z_0} + \omega_{z_1} \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \omega_{z_2} \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \omega_{z_3} \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= 2 + 1.04004 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + 0.691078 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} - 0.470486 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}),\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

where the coefficients α_j , β_j , σ_j , τ_j , δ_j , ω_{z_j} , $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, are explicitly listed in Appendix A and

$$\lambda_x = \sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{7}} + \frac{3^{2/3}(7 + 8\sqrt{7})}{14\sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{7}}} \mu^{1/3} + \dots$$

By applying (21) we obtain the following expansion in series of the threshold value:

$$E_1 = 0.337333 - 0.121141 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.0187564 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} - 0.115146 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}). \quad (41)$$

For L_2 it results:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \alpha_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \alpha_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= -0.0956176 + 0.22769 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.239225 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + 0.0968215 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}})\end{aligned}\quad (42)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\beta &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \beta_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \beta_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= -0.0775862 + 0.230678 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.245705 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + 0.114424 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}})\end{aligned}\quad (43)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma &= \sigma_0 + \sigma_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \sigma_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \sigma_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= 0.0306614 + 0.341373 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.437685 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + 0.198195 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}})\end{aligned}\quad (44)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tau &= \tau_0 + \tau_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \tau_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \tau_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= -0.101288 + 0.0583243 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.0245161 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + 0.00785379 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}),\end{aligned}\quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &= \delta_0 + \delta_1 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \delta_2 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \delta_3 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= 0.0715942 + 0.0240373 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.0150446 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + 0.0135912 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}),\end{aligned}\quad (46)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_z &= \omega_{z_0} + \omega_{z_1} \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + \omega_{z_2} \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} + \omega_{z_3} \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\ &= 2. - 1.04004 \mu^{\frac{1}{3}} + 0.691078 \mu^{\frac{2}{3}} - 1.02951 \mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}),\end{aligned}\quad (47)$$

and

$$\lambda_x = \sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{7}} - \frac{3^{2/3}(7 + 8\sqrt{7})}{14\sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{7}}} \mu^{1/3} + \dots$$

which lead to the expansion in series of the threshold value:

$$E_1 = 0.337333 + 0.121141\mu^{\frac{1}{3}} - 0.0187564\mu^{\frac{2}{3}} - 0.0605633\mu + O(\mu^{\frac{4}{3}}). \quad (48)$$

Actually the quality of the first-order prediction based on the two series (41) and (48) is not limited to small values of the mass ratio. As it can be seen in Figure 1 the difference between the bifurcation thresholds computed via the second order value provided in (26) (continuous lines) and via the two series (41) and (48) (dashed curves) is quite small in the whole parameter range, especially in the case of L_1 .

5.5. The limit of small mass ratio and the Kepler problem: analytic first-order expressions.

The expansion of the distance of L_3 from the largest primary in the limit of small μ is given by

$$\gamma_3 = 1 - \frac{7}{12}\mu + \frac{7}{12}\mu^2 - \frac{1127}{20736}\mu^3 + O(\mu^4).$$

For L_3 the coefficients appearing in (13) can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \alpha_1\mu + \alpha_2\mu^2 + \alpha_3\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) \\ &= -0.523438\mu + 5.21802\mu^2 - 43.3717\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \beta_1\mu + \beta_2\mu^2 + \beta_3\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) \\ &= -0.0175781\mu + 0.0517578\mu^2 - 0.0563431\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \sigma_2\mu^2 + \sigma_3\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) \\ &= 1.53125\mu^2 - 10.1685\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \tau_1\mu + \tau_2\mu^2 + \tau_3\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) \\ &= -0.15625\mu + 0.27417\mu^2 - 1.27731\mu^3 + O(\mu^4), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$\delta = \delta_1\mu + \delta_2\mu^2 + \delta_3\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) = 0.4375\mu + O(\mu^2), \quad (53)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_z &= \omega_{z_0} + \omega_{z_1}\mu + \omega_{z_2}\mu^2 + \omega_{z_3}\mu^3 + O(\mu^4) \\ &= 1 + 0.4375\mu - 1.61784\mu^2 + 6.75039\mu^3 + O(\mu^4), \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where $\alpha_j, \beta_j, \sigma_j, \tau_j, \delta_j, \omega_{z_j}$ $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, are given in Appendix A and

$$\lambda_x = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{21}{2}}\sqrt{\mu} + O(\mu^{3/2}).$$

The explicit expression of the first-order bifurcation threshold is

$$E_1 = 0.321839 + 1.18875\mu - 5.9889\mu^2 - 108.784\mu^3 + O(\mu^4).$$

In the light of these expansions, we have an easy way to interpret the peculiarity of the dynamics around L_3 for small masses. In fact, a puzzling issue is the finite value of the threshold (see the green curve of Fig.1) in the limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$. The reason is that every term in the normal form of degree higher than two *vanishes identically with the detuning* and, since we have that

$$\frac{\delta}{\omega_z} = \frac{7}{16}\mu + O(\mu^2),$$

they identically vanish in the mass ratio. This degeneracy is due to the fact that, being the dynamics essentially that of the Kepler problem with frequencies $\kappa_y^{(1)} \sim \kappa_z^{(1)} \sim 1 + O(\mu)$, perturbed by terms with coefficients

$$c_n = (-1)^n + C_n\mu$$

with the C_n numbers of order one, all terms of degree zero in μ disappear from the normal form [23].

We may say that we are now in the framework of a *singular perturbation problem* [1], that we can define as follows: a perturbation problem in a small parameter (μ in the present case) in which the solution of the unperturbed problem (the isotropic harmonic oscillator in this case, corresponding to the first-order epicyclic version of the Kepler problem) has qualitative features distinctly different from those of the exact solution for arbitrarily small, but nonzero values of μ . In the words of Bender & Orszag [1]: “...the exact solution for $\varepsilon = 0$ ($\mu = 0$ in our case) is *fundamentally different in character* from the *neighboring* solutions obtained in the limit $\varepsilon = 0$ ”. This fundamentally different character is due to the fact that the unperturbed problem has *only* periodic orbits, whereas the perturbed problem, for each non-vanishing value of the perturbation parameter, has generically quasi-periodic orbits and isolated families of periodic orbits triggered by the resonance. Another factor which enhances the peculiarity of the case of L_3 in the limit of small μ is the difference with L_1 and L_2 in the limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$: in this case we obtain Hill’s problem [15] and the unperturbed model is now the *anisotropic harmonic oscillator*, since the detuning term does not vanish in the limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$. We see therefore a clear example of the peculiarity of a case in which a super-integrable system is perturbed by a non-linear coupling which removes its intrinsic degeneracy, when compared with the more usual case of a perturbation of a Liouville integrable system which is in general non-degenerate. However, the finite value of the threshold for $\mu \rightarrow 0$ must still be considered a consistent prediction in the light of the singularity of the perturbation problem. A hint to the reliability of this prediction comes from the observation that the rotation number (23) around the Lyapunov planar orbit tends to zero (see also [28], Section 4.5) and the time-scale of instability *diverges* in time with a rate exponentially small in μ . These statements are easily verified by using (22) and observing that every term appearing in the argument of the square root vanishes with μ .

Anyway, the predictions of the bifurcation threshold is given in Figure 1 as the dot-dashed curve, which is based on the second-order expression (25). With

reference to Table 3, we have good arguments to suspect that the optimal order of truncation is very small, probably not greater than the second one (namely, degree six in the phase-space variables). Therefore, for L_3 there should be no improvement in going to higher orders.

6. Conclusion

We performed the analysis of the bifurcation sequences of 1:1 resonant Hamiltonian normal forms, which arise from the center manifold reduction of the collinear points of the circular restricted 3-body problem. The family of Hamiltonians obtained with this procedure is composed of perturbations of 2-DOF harmonic oscillators with slightly different unperturbed frequencies. The harmonic oscillators can be used as integrable approximations of the non-integrable dynamical system on the center manifold. The rich structure of the system on the center manifold can be investigated with geometric methods, by looking for the existence and stability of critical points of the reduced 1-DOF system. These solutions correspond to periodic orbits of the 2-DOF normal form. In particular, the bifurcation of periodic orbits in general position from the horizontal normal mode is associated with the existence of the (stable) family of halo orbits. We compared the analytical prediction with data obtained from numerical experiments by computing the value of the energy threshold at which the bifurcation occurs for arbitrary values of the mass parameter. An explicit formula for the threshold as a function of this parameter is obtained starting from the first-order normal form. A better precision is obtained by normalizing at higher order for a discrete set of the mass parameter and then interpolating among the resulting values.

The predictions obtained through our analytical results are remarkably good for the two collinear points L_1 and L_2 for any value of the mass parameter in the range $0 < \mu \leq 1/2$. For what concerns L_3 , the results are reliable only for values of the mass parameter greater than about 10^{-2} and quickly worsen with decreasing μ below this value; in the Earth-Moon case, the second-order prediction agrees with the numerical datum only at the first decimal place. The finite value of the threshold for $\mu \rightarrow 0$ must be considered a consistent prediction only in the light of the singular nature of the perturbation problem. A more effective way to treat this case most probably needs a radical change of the model to which the perturbation method is applied.

Acknowledgements. We thank the anonymous reviewers for comments and suggestions which helped to improve our work. We also thank G. Gómez and J. M. Mondelo for providing unpublished numerical data and C. Efthymiopoulos, A. Giorgilli and H. Hanßmann for useful discussions. M.C. was supported by the European MC-ITN grant Astronet-II. A.C. was partially supported by PRIN-MIUR 2010JJ4KPA_009, GNFM-INdAM and by the European MC-ITN grant Astronet-II. G.P. was partially supported by the European MC-ITN grant Stardust and by GNFM-INdAM.

References

References

- [1] C. M. Bender, S. A. Orszag, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers I: Asymptotic Methods and Perturbation Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1999)
- [2] H. Broer, C. Simó, *Resonance Tongues in Hill's Equations: a Geometric Approach*, J. Diff. Eq. **166**, 290–327 (2000)
- [3] S. Bucciarelli, M. Ceccaroni, A. Celletti, G. Pucacco, *Qualitative and analytical results of the bifurcation thresholds to halo orbits*, Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata, doi:10.1007/s10231-015-0474-2 (2015)
- [4] A. Celletti, *Stability and Chaos in Celestial Mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin; published in association with Praxis Publishing Ltd., Chichester, ISBN: 978-3-540-85145-5 (2010)
- [5] A. Celletti, G. Pucacco, D. Stella, *Lissajous and Halo orbits in the restricted three-body problem*, J. Nonlinear Science **25**, Issue 2, 343–370 (2015)
- [6] C. C. Conley, *Low energy transit orbits in the restricted three-body problem*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. **16**, n. 4, 732–746 (1968)
- [7] C. Efthymiopoulos, A. Giorgilli, G. Contopoulos, *Nonconvergence of formal integrals: II. Improved Estimates for the Optimal Order of Truncation*, Journal of Physics A: Math. Gen. **37**, 10831–10858 (2004)
- [8] S. Ferraz-Mello, *Canonical Perturbation Theories*, Springer-Verlag (2007)
- [9] G. Gómez, À. Llibre, J. Martinez, C. Simó, *Dynamics and Mission Design Near Libration Points, Vol. I: Fundamentals: the Case of Collinear Libration Points*, World Scientific, Singapore, ISBN: 981-02-4285-9 (2001)
- [10] G. Gómez, À. Jorba, J. Masdemont, C. Simó, *Dynamics and mission design near libration points. Vol. III: Advanced methods for collinear points*, World Scientific, Singapore, ISBN: 981-02-4211-5 (2001)
- [11] G. Gómez, J. M. Mondelo, *The dynamics around the collinear equilibrium points of the RTBP*, Physica D **157**, 283–321 (2001)
- [12] G. Gómez, J. M. Mondelo, *Private communication* (2014)
- [13] À. Jorba, J. Masdemont, *Dynamics in the center manifold of the collinear points of the restricted three body problem*, Physica D **132**, 189–213 (1999)
- [14] M. Hénon, *Vertical stability of periodic orbits in the restricted problem. I. Equal masses*, Astron. & Astrophys. **28**, 415–426 (1973)

- [15] M. Hénon, *Vertical stability of periodic orbits in the restricted problem. II. Hill's case*, *Astron. & Astrophys.* **30**, 317–321 (1974)
- [16] J. Henrard, *Periodic orbits emanating from a resonant equilibrium*, *Celestial Mechanics* **1**, 437–466 (1970)
- [17] G. W. Hill, *Researches in the Lunar Theory*, *American J. of Mathematics* **1**, n. 1, 5–26 (1878)
- [18] K. C. Howell, *Three-dimensional, periodic, 'halo' orbits*, *Celestial Mechanics* **32**, 53–71 (1984)
- [19] A. Marchesiello, G. Pucacco, *Relevance of the 1:1 resonance in galactic dynamics*, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **126**: 104 (2011)
- [20] A. Marchesiello, G. Pucacco, *Equivariant singularity analysis of the 2:2 resonance*, *Nonlinearity*, **27**, 43–66 (2014).
- [21] J. J. Morales-Ruiz, C. Simó, S. Simon, *Algebraic proof of the non-integrability of Hill's problem*, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, **25**, 1237–1256 (2005).
- [22] C. D. Murray, S. F. Dermott, *Solar system dynamics*, Cambridge University Press (1999)
- [23] G. Pucacco, *Normal forms for the epicyclic approximations of the Kepler problem*, *New Astronomy* **17**, 475–482 (2012)
- [24] G. Pucacco, A. Marchesiello, *An energy-momentum map for the time-reversal symmetric 1:1 resonance with $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry*, *Physica D* **271**, 10–18 (2014)
- [25] D. L. Richardson, *Analytic construction of periodic orbits about the collinear points*, *Celestial Mechanics* **22**, 241–253 (1980)
- [26] J. A. Sanders, F. Verhulst, J. Murdock, *Averaging Methods in Nonlinear Dynamical Systems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2007)
- [27] C. Simó, *Effective Computations in Celestial Mechanics and Astrodynamics*, in “Modern Methods of Analytical Mechanics and their Applications”, V. V. Rumyantsev and A. V. Karapetyan eds., CISM Courses and Lectures 387, 55–102, Springer, Vienna (1998)
- [28] C. Simó, *Dynamical properties in Hamiltonian Systems. Applications to Celestial Mechanics*, Lectures delivered at the Centre de Recerca Matemàtica on January 27–31, 2014: <http://www.maia.ub.es/dsg/2014/#1>.
- [29] F. Verhulst, *Discrete symmetric dynamical systems at the main resonances with applications to axi-symmetric galaxies*, Royal Society (London), *Philosophical Transactions, Series A* **290**, 435–465 (1979)

Appendix A.

For the case of L_1 we expand the coefficients of the normal form as in (35)–(38) and we obtain the following expressions:

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{430-1561\sqrt{7}}{38696}$$

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{403681129-710133214\sqrt{7}}{4492141248 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{3}}}$$

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{7615912047925-15138513232696\sqrt{7}}{65185461649728 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$\alpha_3 = \frac{215057379347641787-579355824477908807\sqrt{7}}{11350874807990436096}$$

$$\beta_0 = -\frac{9}{116}$$

$$\beta_1 = -\frac{5969 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}{53824}$$

$$\beta_2 = -\frac{1595507}{3121792 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$\beta_3 = -\frac{54403463}{543191808}$$

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{3}{116} \sqrt{\frac{3}{7}(-383 + 146\sqrt{7})}$$

$$\sigma_1 = -\frac{3^{\frac{1}{6}}(6769553-1082463\sqrt{7})\sqrt{163+554\sqrt{7}}}{554508304}$$

$$\sigma_2 = -\frac{\sqrt{-(449909592683863331/7)+46284461373137666\sqrt{7}}}{458903424 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{6}}}$$

$$\sigma_3 = -\frac{\sqrt{-(13566178178821726882825/7)+(2168079445680944572231\sqrt{7})/2}}{186314790144}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_0 &= \frac{24876(-7+5\sqrt{7})-\sqrt{-690114225129+401295726258\sqrt{7}}}{4488736} \\
\tau_1 &= \frac{-245552521-116666072\sqrt{7}-1329626630465352\sqrt{3}(-9800+12771\sqrt{7})}{292227113679182349696 \cdot 3^{\frac{5}{6}}} \\
\tau_2 &= -\frac{27(2468130674602081363-1313792742465604742\sqrt{7})\sqrt{1+2\sqrt{7}}}{686797152843693394944 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{6}}} \\
&\quad -\frac{5528(203(17991621401387-4467226286908\sqrt{7})\sqrt{85+62\sqrt{7}}+77351922\sqrt{3}(-45133312+6427123\sqrt{7}))}{686797152843693394944 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{6}}} \\
\tau_3 &= \frac{4279772896+13509602135\sqrt{7}}{652101765504} \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{6116768064815454196125696} \left(-\frac{1831253762265104918553131340897210768586201172585}{21} \right. \\
&\quad \left. +\frac{418836965618388593658800818441465281265686267626\sqrt{7}}{3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\delta_0 &= -2 + \sqrt{-1+2\sqrt{7}} \\
\delta_1 &= -\frac{\left(63(-5+7\sqrt{7})-\sqrt{42(8366+3367\sqrt{7})} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}}{14^{\frac{2}{3}}} \\
\delta_2 &= -\frac{1127-2\sqrt{-164668+177086\sqrt{7}}}{784 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}} \\
\delta_3 &= \frac{271}{576} - \frac{\sqrt{-\left(\frac{64736369}{21}\right)+\left(\frac{12691777\sqrt{7}}{6}\right)}}{3528} \\
\omega_{z_0} &= 2 \\
\omega_{z_1} &= \frac{3^{\frac{2}{3}}}{2} \\
\omega_{z_2} &= \frac{23}{16 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}} \\
\omega_{z_3} &= -\frac{271}{576} .
\end{aligned}$$

For the case of L_2 , the first few terms of the expansions, see (42)–(45), are given by the following expressions:

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{430-1561\sqrt{7}}{38696}$$

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{-403681129+710133214\sqrt{7}}{4492141248 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{3}}}$$

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{7615912047925-15138513232696\sqrt{7}}{65185461649728 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$\alpha_3 = \frac{40926888746031829+399917417520057479\sqrt{7}}{11350874807990436096}$$

$$\beta_0 = -\frac{9}{116}$$

$$\beta_1 = \frac{5969 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}{53824}$$

$$\beta_2 = -\frac{1595507}{3121792 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$\beta_3 = \frac{62154119}{543191808}$$

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{3}{116} \sqrt{\frac{3}{7}(-383 + 146\sqrt{7})}$$

$$\sigma_1 = -\frac{3^{\frac{1}{6}} \sqrt{-67904593148+38942326934\sqrt{7}}}{659344}$$

$$\sigma_2 = -\frac{(1708763+1211194\sqrt{7})\sqrt{829508697716939878135+578984163829071428654\sqrt{7}}}{138280013612108928 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{6}}}$$

$$\sigma_3 = \frac{\sqrt{14(-28252063020622261270706+17893665708209519504017\sqrt{7})}}{2608407062016}$$

$$\tau_0 = \frac{24876(-7+5\sqrt{7})-\sqrt{-690114225129+401295726258\sqrt{7}}}{4488736}$$

$$\tau_1 = \frac{11459544\sqrt{3}(-9800+12771\sqrt{7})-\sqrt{7(514623902740673071495+449268874694104189382\sqrt{7})}}{2518593859712 \cdot 3^{\frac{5}{6}}}$$

$$\tau_2 = -\frac{1998918662848+3099921346832\sqrt{7}}{8478977195601153024 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$-\frac{3\sqrt{21(551490804086039521092038535457867+1332711986256602497930974056496554\sqrt{7})}}{8478977195601153024 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$\tau_3 = \frac{372558368+290138113\sqrt{7}}{652101765504}$$

$$+\frac{1}{6116768064815454196125696} \left(-\frac{5908980415228982864846540204241770944533372591017}{21} \right. \\ \left. +\frac{320636313928575557216801412344520038042793561962\sqrt{7}}{3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\delta_0 = -2 + \sqrt{-1 + 2\sqrt{7}}$$

$$\delta_1 = \frac{\left(63(-5+7\sqrt{7}) - \sqrt{42(8366+3367\sqrt{7})}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}}{14^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$\delta_2 = \frac{-1127+2\sqrt{-164668+177086\sqrt{7}}}{784 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$\delta_3 = \frac{593}{576} - \frac{\sqrt{-\frac{187748909}{21} + \frac{49407673\sqrt{7}}{6}}}{3528}$$

$$\omega_{z_0} = 2$$

$$\omega_{z_1} = -\frac{3^{\frac{2}{3}}}{2}$$

$$\omega_{z_2} = \frac{23}{16 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}}}$$

$$\omega_{z_3} = -\frac{593}{576}.$$

Finally for L_3 the coefficients introduced in (49)–(52) take the form:

$$\alpha_1 = -\frac{67}{128}$$

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{21373}{4096}$$

$$\alpha_3 = \frac{974455051 - 909621504 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}} \cdot 14^{\frac{1}{3}} + 299761632 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot 14^{\frac{2}{3}}}{24772608}$$

$$\beta_1 = -\frac{9}{512}$$

$$\beta_2 = \frac{53}{1024}$$

$$\beta_3 = -\frac{7385}{131072}$$

$$\sigma_1 = 0$$

$$\sigma_2 = \frac{49}{32}$$

$$\sigma_3 = -\frac{20825}{2048}$$

$$\tau_1 = -\frac{5}{32}$$

$$\tau_2 = \frac{1123}{4096}$$

$$\tau_3 = \frac{3876274583 - 1819243008 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}} \cdot 14^{\frac{1}{3}} + 599523264 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot 14^{\frac{2}{3}}}{173408256}$$

$$\delta_0 = 0$$

$$\delta_1 = \frac{7}{16}$$

$$\delta_2 = -\frac{2485}{1536}$$

$$\delta_3 = \frac{-951281609+454810752 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}} \cdot 14^{\frac{1}{3}}-149880816 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot 14^{\frac{2}{3}}}{10838016}$$

$$\omega_{z_0} = 1$$

$$\omega_{z_1} = \frac{7}{16}$$

$$\omega_{z_2} = \frac{161}{1536}$$

$$\omega_{z_3} = \frac{-1024017503+454810752 \cdot 3^{\frac{2}{3}} \cdot 14^{\frac{1}{3}}-149880816 \cdot 3^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot 14^{\frac{2}{3}}}{10838016} \ .$$